

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated October 13, 2005 in which the Examiner rejected claims 1, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), rejected claims 2-7, 15, 16, 21, 24, 27, 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103 and objected to claims 8-14 and 7-19 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

As indicated above, claim 5, 7-8 and 15 have been amended to make explicit what is implicit in the claims. The amendment is unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability and do not narrow the literal scope of the claims.

Claims 1, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Kajita* (U.S. Patent No. 5,999,708).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). The claims have been reviewed in light of the Office Action, and for reasons which will be set forth below, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to the claims and allows the claims to issue.

Kajita appears to disclose in Figure 1 a digital copy machine 1 consisting of a central processing unit 101, a read only memory 102, a random-access memory 103, a PC card interface 104 for connecting a PC card, a detachable PC card 105, a floppy disk drive interface 106, a floppy disk drive 107, a liquid crystal display controller 108, a liquid crystal display 109, a key input interface 110, a touch panel 111, an operation key 112, an image memory 113, a scanner interface 114, a scanner 115, a printer interface 116, a printer 117, an external interface 118, a floppy disk 119 and an infrared ray sensor 120. (Col. 2, lines 53-64). The scanner 115 reads an original image by scanning an original placed on an original support plate

the printer 117 prints out the image data which is received via the external interface 118 (col. 3, lines 30-33).

Thus *Kajita* merely discloses a digital copying machine. Nothing in *Kajita* shows, teaches or suggests a camera system or camera as claimed in claims 1, 20, 22, 23, 25. Furthermore, nothing in *Kajita* shows, teaches or suggests a camera for photographing an object as claimed in claims 1, 20 and 22. Rather, *Kajita* is merely directed to a digital copying machine having a scanner. Applicants respectfully point out that a copy machine is used to reproduce an original image and is not for photography (i.e., a scanner is not a camera).

Since nothing in *Kajita* shows, teaches or suggests a camera or camera system as claimed in claims 1, 20, 22, 23 and 25, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to the claims and allows the claims to issue.

Claims 26 and 28 depend from claims 20 and 23 and recite additional features. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 26 and 28 would not have been anticipated by *Kajita* within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §102(e) at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Kajita*. Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Kajita* in view of *Kodak EOS DCS 1/3/5 Digital Cameras User's Manual* and *Parulski* (U.S. Patent No. 5,402,170).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103. The claims have been reviewed in light of the Office Action, and for

reasons which will be set forth below, Applicants respectfully requests the Examiner withdraws the rejection to the claims and allows the claims to issue.

As discussed above, *Kajita* is merely directed to a copy machine which copies and prints documents and is not directed to a camera or camera system. (i.e. a scanner is not a camera). Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of *Kajita* taken alone or in combination with other references will not overcome the deficiencies of the primary reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Kodak* (Kodak Digital Science DC 120 Zoom Digital Camera User's Guide) in view of *Duggan* (U.S. Patent No. 5,584,035).

Kodak merely discloses a computer display window showing a folder. Nothing in *Kodak* shows, teaches or suggests displaying a folder on a display which functions together with a computer based on a command signal transmitted by a camera as claimed in claim 5.

Dugan et al. appears to disclose a user dragging an icon or a secondary objection from one window to another icon on the same window. Nothing in *Dugan et al.*, shows, teaches or suggests displaying a folder on a display which functions together with a computer based on a command signal transmitted by a camera as claimed in claim 5. Rather, *Dugan* merely discloses dragging an icon on a screen.

Since neither *Kodak* or *Dugan* show, teach or suggest displaying a folder on a display, functioning together with a computer based on a command signal

transmitted by the camera as claimed in claim 5, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Kodak* in view *Dugan* and further in view of *Parulski*.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of the claim under 35 U.S.C. §103. The claim has been reviewed in light of the Office Action, and for reasons which will be set forth below, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to the claim and allows the claim to issue.

As discussed above, since nothing in the combination of *Kodak* and *Dugan* shows, teach or suggest the primary features as claimed in claim 5, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of the primary references with the secondary reference to *Parulski* will not overcome the deficiencies of the primary references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 7, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Imaeda* (U.S. Patent No. 5,473,366) in view of *Shibata* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0018114).

Imaeda merely discloses a TV telephone main body 101 and handset 109. The main body 101 comprises a display 219 for displaying received images and a camera 205 for taking pictures of a user.

Thus, nothing in *Imaeda et al.* shows, teaches or suggests changing the number of pixels of a display data on an image display of a camera different from a display functioning together with a computer as claimed in claims 7 and 15. Rather, *Imaeda* merely discloses a camera and a display.

Shibata et al. appears to disclose two picture data are selected from among three picture data and are multiplexed and output in major and minor frame areas.

Thus, *Shibata* merely discloses a display with a picture within a picture. Nothing in *Shibata* shows, teaches or suggests changing the number of pixels of display data on an image display of a camera different from a display functioning together with a computer as claimed in claims 7 and 15. Rather, *Shibata* merely discloses displaying two pictures one within the other.

Since nothing in *Imaeda* or *Shibata* show, teach or suggest changing the number of pixels of display data on an image display of a camera different from a display functioning together with a computer as claimed in claims 7 and 15, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 7 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claim 16 depends from claim 15 and recites additional features. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 16 would not have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §103 over *Imaeda* and *Shibata* at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 7 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 21 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Kajita* in view of *Ward* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0142215) and *Kodak*.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103. The claims have been reviewed in light of the Office Action, and for reasons which will be set forth below, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraws the rejection to the claims and allows the claims to issue.

As discussed above, *Kajita* is merely directed to a digital copy machine having a scanner for scanning a document on a support plate. The scanner in *Kajita* is not a camera system and is not a camera for photographing an object. Therefore, even if *Kajita* is combined with the remaining references, nothing in the combination of the references will show, teach or suggest a camera system comprising a camera for photographing an object, a computer connectable to the camera, a memory provided in the camera storing a display of dialog pertaining to transfer of a display of the camera and a display functioning together with the computer as claimed in claim 21. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 27 depends from claim 21 and recites additional features. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 21 would not have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §103 over *Kajita*, *Ward* and *Kodak* at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claim 24 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Kajita* in view of *Kodak*.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103. The claims have been reviewed in light of the Office Action, and for reasons which will be set forth below, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to the claims and allows the claims to issue.

As discussed above, *Kajita* is merely directed to a copy machine having a scanner which reads a document by scanning a document on a support plate. Nothing in *Kajita* shows, teaches or suggests a camera or a camera comprising a

memory for registering an operation including synchronous display of dialog on a display of a camera and a display functioning together with a computer as claimed in claim 24. Rather, *Kajita* is merely directed to a copying machine for copying documents.

Since nothing in *Kajita* show, teach or suggest the primary features as claimed in claim 24, the combination of *Kodak* with *Kajita* would not overcome the deficiencies of *Kajita*. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claim 29 depends from claim 24 and recites additional features. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 29 would not have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §103 over the references at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Since objected to claims 8-14 and 17-29 depend from allowable claims, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the objection thereto.

The prior art of record, which is not relied upon, is acknowledged. The references taken singularly or in combination do not anticipate or make obvious the claimed invention.

Thus it now appears that the application is in condition for reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact, by telephone, the Applicants'

undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

Date: March 13, 2006

By: 

Ellen Marcie Emas
Registration No. 32,131

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620